cause of its being committed to the hands of a parent, as a motive to good behaviour from his children.

The three following clauses of this same will must be considered together; they are in these words: I give and bequeath to my son-in-law, William Bowie, of Walter, one-third of my negroes. The whole of my negroes to be valued by two impartial men, not related to either side, and divided into three classes, as equal in value, considering age and sex, as can be; and then each class to be distributed by lot. The first number giving the first choice; the second number giving the second choice; and the third number giving the third choice. But in case William Bowie, of Walter, should set up a claim to any of the negroes, at either place, more than then at the Quarter, he and his wife to be barred from any right or title to my real estate. Also, one-third of my stock of all sorts, to be valued, classed, and distributed as the negroes aforesaid; likewise all my household and kitchen furniture, except what I bequeath hereafter, I give to my said son-inlaw, William Bowie, of Walter.'

'I give and bequeath to my grandson, William D. Bowie, one-third of my negroes, and one-third of my stock of all sorts; all my plate; one eight-day clock; two large looking-glasses; two feather beds and their furniture.'

'I give and bequeath the other third of negroes and stock of all sorts to the rest of the children of William Bowie, of Walter, by his present wife Kitty, as they arrive at age, or marry, share and share alike. I mean the age of sixteen, for girls.'

From the terms in which these donations are made it is perfectly clear, that the legatee of neither class was to derive any advantage from the negroes thus appropriated among them, more than was expressly given. William Bowie could not have the use and profits of any more than the class which might by lot fall to him. The profits of the third given to his son William D. Bowie certainly vested in him at once; and so, too, the profits of the other third, which were awarded by lot to the rest of the children vested in them as a specific legacy.

A father is bound to maintain his infant children, if able, (e) and, therefore, nothing is ever allowed to him for that purpose out of the infants' peculiar estate, unless upon special grounds. It

⁽e) 2 Inst. 112; Harvey v. Harvey, Barnard, C. Rep. 107; Butler v. Butler, 3 Atk. 60; Rawlins v. Goldfrop, 5 Ves. 444.